REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa et al. (US 6,063,527) and in view of XIA et al. ("Soft Lithography." Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 1998, pp. 550-575) and in further view of Song et al. (US 2001/0019382).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 11 and 16 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending for further consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishikawa, XIA and Song. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method of forming a color filter layer including, in part, "… wherein the first time is determined by $t1 = (2\eta 1 z1^2)/(R1\gamma 1 \cos\theta 1)$, where t1 is the first time, $\eta 1$ is a viscosity of the first color resin, z1 is a length of the first channel, R1 is a hydraulic radius of the first color resin, $\gamma 1$ is an interface free energy between the first color resin and an air, and $\theta 1$ is a contact angle between the first color resin and the first mold; … wherein the second time is determined by $t2 = (2\eta 2 z2^2)/(R2\gamma 2 \cos\theta 2)$, where t2 is the second time, $\eta 2$ is a viscosity of the second color resin, z2 is a length of the second channel, R2 is a hydraulic radius of the second color resin, $\gamma 2$ is an interface free energy

between the second color resin and the air, and $\theta 2$ is a contact angle between the second color resin and the second mold; … wherein the third time is determined by $t3 = (2\eta 3z3^2)/(R3\gamma 3\cos\theta 3)$, where t3 is the third time, $\eta 3$ is a viscosity of the third color resin, z3 is a length of the third channel, R3 is a hydraulic radius of the third color resin, $\gamma 3$ is an interface free energy between the third color resin and the air, and $\theta 3$ is a contact angle between the third color resin and the third mold …." The cited references do not teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-10, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 11, as amended, recites a method of forming a color filter layer including, in part, "… wherein the first time is determined by $t1 = (2\eta 1z1^2)/(R1\gamma 1\cos\theta 1)$, where t1 is the first time, $\eta 1$ is a viscosity of the first color resin, z1 is a length of the first channel, R1 is a hydraulic radius of the first color resin, $\gamma 1$ is an interface free energy between the first color resin and an air, and $\theta 1$ is a contact angle between the first color resin and the first mold … wherein the second time is determined by $t2 = (2\eta 2z2^2)/(R2\gamma 2\cos\theta 2)$, where t2 is the second time, $\eta 2$ is a viscosity of the second color resin, z2 is a length of the second channel, R2 is a hydraulic radius of the second color resin, $\gamma 2$ is an interface free energy between the second color resin and the air, and $\theta 2$ is a contact angle between the second color resin and the second mold … wherein the third time is determined by $t3 = (2\eta 3z3^2)/(R3\gamma 3\cos\theta 3)$, where t3 is the third time, $\eta 3$ is a viscosity of the third color resin, z3 is a length of the third channel, R3 is a hydraulic radius of the third color resin, $\gamma 3$ is an interface free energy between the third color resin and the air, and $\theta 3$ is a contact angle

between the third color resin and the third mold …." The cited references do not teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 and claims 12-15, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 16, as amended, recites a method of fabricating a color filter substrate for a liquid crystal display device including, in part, "… wherein the first time is determined by $t1 = (2\eta 1 z1^2)/(R1\gamma 1 \cos\theta 1)$, where t1 is the first time, $\eta 1$ is a viscosity of the first color resin, z1 is a length of the first channel, R1 is a hydraulic radius of the first color resin, $\gamma 1$ is an interface free energy between the first color resin and an air, and $\theta 1$ is a contact angle between the first color resin and the first mold … wherein the second time is determined by $t2 = (2\eta 2 z2^2)/(R2\gamma 2 \cos\theta 2)$, where t2 is the second time, $\eta 2$ is a viscosity of the second color resin, z2 is a length of the second channel, R2 is a hydraulic radius of the second color resin, $\gamma 2$ is an interface free energy between the second color resin and the air, and $\theta 2$ is a contact angle between the second color resin and the second mold … wherein the third time is determined by $t3 = (2\eta 3 z3^2)/(R3\gamma 3 \cos\theta 3)$, where t3 is the third time, $\eta 3$ is a viscosity of the third color resin, z3 is a length of the third channel, R3 is a hydraulic radius of the third color resin, $\gamma 3$ is an interface free energy between the third color resin and the air, and $\theta 3$ is a contact angle between the third color resin and the third mold …." The cited references do not teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 and claims 17-20, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-20 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully request the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: /Xiaobin You/
Xiaobin You
Reg. No. 62,510

Date: July 20, 2010

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000